

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING D	ATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/900,272	07/06/2	001	Tao Chen	PA010368 7587		
23696	7590	01/04/2006		EXAMINER		
QUALCOM	•		MARCELO, MELVIN C			
5775 MOREI SAN DIEGO				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
SAN DILGO	, 011)2121			2662		
				DATE MAILED: 01/04/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			~ 12					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	V.					
Advisory Action	09/900,272	CHEN, TAO						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Melvin Marcelo	2662						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 December 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.						
 . The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. 								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the			er is later. In no					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	. ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI).	RST REPLY WAS FILE						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be a since a notice of Appeal has been filed.	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.					
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belappeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. $igsqcup$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)						
13. Other:								
		Melvin Marcelo Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2662	4					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Chen '650 clearly teaches that the transmission schedule is based on collected information which includes scheduled and unscheduled tasks at the remote station (column 9, lines 42-50). This is an explicit suggestion to those of ordinary skill in the art by Chen '650 to collect information regarding the tasks at the remote station. Both Cudak et al. and Criss et al. were cited to show that it is known in the prior art for the remote station to transmit with the ARQ protocol (feedback relationship protocol) or the pre-scheduled transmission, respectively. Thus, ARQ protocol and pre-scheduled transmission are known tasks at a remote station. Based on Chen '650's explicit suggestion, a skilled artisan would have been motivated in determining the schedule to collect information regarding ARQ protocol (feedback relationship) and pre-scheduled transmission since such tasks are known to occur at the remote station and would have been clearly pertinent information in determining the schedule.

Applicant's arguments regarding Cudak et al. and Criss et al. are not persuasive since the two references are modifying references to the base reference Chen '650 cited to show that known tasks at the remote station include ARQ and pre-scheduled transmission. Applicant is arguing other features of Cudak et al. and Criss et al., rather than whether the it is known in the prior art by their teachings that remote station tasks include the ARQ protocol and pre-scheduled transmission.